REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 16-33 are pending in the present application. Claims 8-15 have previously been cancelled. Claims 1, 16, 21, and 30 are independent.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Dorfman Rejection

Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dorfman (USP 6,449,651). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Dorfman discloses a variation on the well-known and quite inconvenient technique of using dongles to provide secure access to a host computer from a remote computer. Essentially, a pair of hardware dongles are utilized, one at each end of the communication channel, to provide a digital, secure handshake between the two computers. More specifically, a first dongle is connected to the host computer and a second dongle is connected to the remote computer. Both dongles have the same encryption algorithm and key. A first level of security is provided by ensuring that the date range stored in the dongle connected to the remote computer is within the authorized date range stored in the host dongle. If the second dongle's access period has expired as determined by cross checking these dates then access is denied. Further security is provided by utilizing the encryption key that is copied in both dongles and which can be verified as further described in Fig. 5 of Dorfman.

As fairly summarized above, Dorfman's solution to remote computer access authenticates the remote computer utilizing the hardware dongle. This is an entirely different concept of operation and certainly does not teach or suggest the invention particularly as recited in the amended independent claims. Conceptually, the invention relies upon a predetermined or otherwise designated communication port. This predetermined or designated communication port is called a "management port" in the specification and claims. This management port is deemed to be authorized for receiving one or more management commands. The claims have been amended to more clearly reflect this inventive concept.

Specifically, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the step of predetermining one port of the computer as a management port and deeming the management port as authorized for receiving one or more management commands. This concept is completely absent and not taught or suggested by Dorfman. Dorfman apparently could care less about which port is physically utilized for the dongles. Instead of predetermining one port as a management port and deeming that port as authorized, Dorfman requires cumbersome dongles to be connected to the host and remote computers such that the dongles may communicate with each other so as to authenticate the remote computer 50 before it is granted access to the host computer 10. There simply is no predetermined port deemed to be authorized for receiving one or more management commands in Dorfman. In the Response to Arguments section of the final Office Action, the Examiner states that "Dorfman provides port management as both dongles need to be in place to have access to either computer via communication ports 14, and 54, Col. 5, Lines 37-52." Page 12, Lines 5-7 of Final Rejection dated November 14, 2006. This argument is specious and rather beside the point, particularly in terms of the amended claim language. The claimed invention is not directed to some generalized concept of "port management" but instead to variations of a specific and powerful concept of predetermining one port of the computer as a management port and deeming the management port as authorized for receiving one or more management commands.

Further in regards to claim 1, Dorfman certainly does not disclose or suggest executing the management command when the management command was received at the management port. This should be read in conjunction with the predetermining and determining steps which respectively (1) predetermines one port as a management port and deems that management port as authorized for receiving management commands and (2) determines whether the management command was received at the management port. Dorfman has no management port concept, particularly as recited in the claims. Thus, Dorfman is unable to determine whether a management command was received at the management port. Further, Dorfman certainly does not execute the management command when the management command was received at the management port. Instead, Dorfman requires a digital handshake between a pair of hardware dongles, irrespective of the port to which these dongles are connected.

Dorfman does not determine whether the management command was received at the management port and does not execute the management command in response to this determination. In essence, Dorfman operates under an entirely different principle and does not disclose or suggest the invention as recited in the independent claims.

In terms of claim 30, Dorfman also does not disclose or suggest identifying a first device coupled to a first port of the computer where the first port is configured to be a management port and deemed to be authorized for receiving one or more management commands. There is no such blanket authorization for a "management port" in Dorfman. Instead, Dorfman's authorization relies upon the pair of hardware dongles and handshakes described in detail above. Moreover, Dorfman does not disclose or suggest determining whether the management command was received at the management port as further recited in claim 30 or authorizing execution of the management command when the management command was received at the management port. Claim 30 is even further distinguished because the last part of claim 30 states that execution is authorized irrespective of an identifier of the first device. In Dorfman, the dongle essentially identified the remote computer. In contrast, claim 30 authorizes execution of the management command irrespective of an identifier of the first device. Thus, Dorfman is completely contrary to and certainly does not disclose or suggest the invention of claim 30.

Although Dorfman is not applied under §102 to reject claims 16 and 21 the features of those claims are addressed here because it is clear that Dorfman is the primary reference relied upon by the Office Action to reject all the claims.

In terms of claim 16, Dorfman does not disclose or suggest an interface comprising one or more ports only one of which is a management port deemed to be authorized for receiving one or more management commends. Again, Dorfman has no such management port concept and certainly does not deem any port as authorized for receiving one or more management commands. Instead, Dorfman requires the pair of dongles to negotiate and verify identity and access rights of the remote computer before permitting any commands received from the remote computer to be executed by the host. In the same vein, Dorfman also does not disclose or suggest the computer of claim 16 which includes an interface that passes the management

command received from the management port to the processor and ignores any management command received at any of the port(s) other than the management port. As argued in detail above, Dorfman has no such management port concept. Dorfman certainly does not ignore management commands depending upon whether the management command was received at the management port (deemed to be authorized) or another port. Instead, Dorfman's techniques are port-insensitive in that it is the dongles which verify the identity and access of the remote computer, not any type of port designation or deeming as it utilized in the present invention. Moreover, Dorfman does not execute the management command received at the management port, at least because there is no management port concept, particularly as defined in amended claim 16.

As to claim 21, Dorfman does not disclose or suggest the claimed management command authorization component that determines whether the management command is authorized based on whether the management command was received and the management port coupled to the communication bus wherein the management port is a predetermined port deemed to be authorized for receiving one or more management commands. Again, the management port concept and its predetermined or deemed authorization is completely absent from Dorfman. There is no determination of authorization based on whether the management command was received at a management port and no such concept is even remotely suggested by Dorfman.

Furthermore, the use of dongles has largely been rejected by the computer community as cumbersome and inconvenient. A dongle consumes an entire physical connection on the computer and thereby renders the computer less usable and functional. In other words, dongles preempt a physical connection. Furthermore, dongle management particularly when there are multiple dongles for multiple remote computers is cumbersome and problematic. The present invention solves all of these problems in a unique and patentable fashion not disclosed or suggested by Dorfman.

Although Applicants do not agree with the Office Action's conclusions regarding dependent claims 2, 3, 5-7, 31, and 32 Applicants wish to focus the patentability of the invention upon the independent claims 1 and 30 at this time. Nevertheless, each of the dependent claims is

believed to be patentable on its own merits and Applicants reserve the right to present future arguments against all such dependent claims.

For all of the above reasons, taken alone or in combination, Applicant's respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 Dorfman rejection.

35 U.S. C. §103 (a) Dorfman-Palm Rejection

Claims 4, 16-29, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorfman in view of Palm (USP 6,873,652). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

As argued above in detail, Dorfman fails to disclose the invention as recited in the independent claims and indeed fails to describe or disclose or suggest anything like the inventive concept as expressed in the claims. Dorfman is clearly relied upon to teach most of the claim features including the management port concepts and its use in determining whether to execute, authorize or forward management commands. The above arguments and amendments clearly distinguish over Dorfman. Furthermore, Palm is merely applied to teach that a communication bus may be a IEEE 1394-compliant serial bus. Although Palm may disclose a IEEE 1394-compliant serial bus, Palm simply does not remedy any of the above noted deficiencies in Dorfman. There is no management port concept, no deeming of a predetermined port as a management port authorized to receive one or more management commands and no suggestions to modify Dorfman to arrive at the claimed invention. Indeed, Palm is solely relied upon to teach the conventionality of IEEE 1394-compliant serial busses coupling between host and received computers. The Office Action clearly does not rely upon Palm to teach any of the other noted features that are clearly absent from Dorfman as noted above. Without an explicit disclosure of each and every feature of the claimed invention, this rejection must fail.

Both independent claims 16 and 21 have been argued above in detail in the arguments against Dorfman above. Furthermore, dependent claims 4, 17-20, 22-29 and 33 are believed to be patentable at least due to there dependency upon the various independent claims which are specifically argued above.

For all of the above reasons, taken alone or in combination, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the §103 Dorfman-Palm rejection.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Michael R. Cammarata Reg. No. 39,491 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant